

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/881,025	06/15/2001	John A. Tomlin	YOR920000712US1	7835	
7	0 01/12/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
McGuireWoods, LLP			BORISSOV, IGOR N		
1750 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 1800 McLean, VA 22102-3915			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3629		
		•	DATE MAILED: 01/12/200	DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	Ų		
Advisory Action	09/881,025	TOMLIN ET AL.			
·	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	Igor Borissov	3629	7000		
		À			
THE REPLY FILED 20 December 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply n places the applicat	to a tion in		
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expires <u>03</u> months from the mailing da b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final (on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or		
timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's	Brief must be filed within the pe				
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be		t the appeal.			
(a) they raise new issues that would require further		see NOTF helow)			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•	500 110 12 501011),			
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	•	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	3 .		
NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	` ' ——				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	amendment		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT	place the		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	newly		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		e. L			
Claim(s) allowed:	77.				
Claim(s) objected to:		v G. Weiss			
Claim(s) rejected:		' PATENT EXAMINER OF CENTER 3880			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
•8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:					

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to the applicant's argument that the sited art does not teach certain features of the applicant's invention, it is noted that Mikurak teaches determining characteristics of the class family of services based on a service class basis, wherein an individual, and/or a class or other grouping of end-users may have different values (cost) (C. 46, L. 14; C. 36, L. 53-58); providing supply (price) and demand data for each known service class of end-users (C. 21, L. 37-48); running a computer model to forecast trends and predict when demand will exceed supply (C. 23; L. 19-21); monitoring bandwidth wholesale cost (C. 279, L. 15-22); and taking appropriate action to keep bandwidth supply within agreed targets for each service class (C. 46, L. 20-27; C. 17, L. 1-12; C. 20, L. 44 - C. 21, L. 14).